

REMARKS

The applicants have considered the Office action dated March 13, 2007, and the reference it cites. By way of this response claims 1, 10, 18 and 19 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are pending and at issue, of which claims 1, 10 and 18 are independent. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9: Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office action rejected pending independent claim 1 as being anticipated by *Lacombe* (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,317) under 35 U.S.C § 102(b). Independent claim 1, as currently amended, recites a write current circuit for a mass media write head comprising, *inter alia*, a circuit coupled with a head write driver circuit and adapted to selectively provide pulsing signals which *independently* define overshoot amplitudes of a positive write edge and a negative write edge respectively of a write current signal.

It is well settled that, “[a] claim is anticipated only if *each and every element as set forth in the claim* is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). Amended independent claim 1, however, is not anticipated because each and every element as set forth in the claim is not found in *Lacombe*. For example, *Lacombe* fails to describe a circuit adapted to selectively provide pulsing signals which *independently* define positive and negative write edge overshoot amplitudes.

In contrast to the claim recitations, *Lacombe* describes, for example, an overshoot current mirror circuit 530 having a single output at node 539 which drives the overshoot differential pair circuit 510 and the switching circuit 520. With its single output overshoot current mirror circuit, the circuit of *Lacombe* does not provide the *independently* defined positive and negative write edge overshoot amplitudes contemplated by pending claim 1. Based on the foregoing deficiency of *Lacombe*, it follows that *Lacombe* does not anticipate “each and every element” of amended claim 1. The applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102 be withdrawn. Furthermore, the applicants respectfully submit that pending claim 1 and claims 2-9 depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Claims 10-17 & 18-19: Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office action rejected claims 10-17 and 18-19 on the same grounds used in its rejection of claim 1. However, independent claims 10 and 18, as amended, are not anticipated by *Lacombe* under the same reasoning provided above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claim 10 and claim 18 under 35 U.S.C § 102 be withdrawn. Furthermore, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, claims 11-17 depending therefrom, claim 18 and claim 19 depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Scope of the Amendments to Claims 1, 10 & 19

The amendments to claims 1 and 10 are merely clarifying in that they remedy any potential ambiguity in the grammatical number agreement between the term “overshoot amplitudes” and the phrase “said positive write

edge and said negative write edge.” Additionally, the amendment to claim 19 corrects a typographical error in the referenced dependency to independent claim 18. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1, 10 and 19 are not made based on reasons related to patentability, are not narrowing and, consequently, do not give rise to prosecution history estoppel or limit the scope of equivalents of these claim under the doctrine of equivalents.

If the examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC.
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1020

By: /Mark C. Zimmerman/
Mark C. Zimmerman
Registration No. 44,006

Attorneys for Texas Instruments, Inc.

Date: September 13, 2007